NOTE FOR: DD/PPS/Planning

FROM: D/PPS

SUBJECT: 1995 Capabilities Paper

STAT   Regarding [ ] paper on 1995 capabilities:

1. 1995 may be a bit too far away. I am not sure I would change it just yet; maybe I need to get the sense of the Planning Working Group members.

2. There needs to be a better distinction made between what the policy group would do and what the steering function of the Planning Working Group is (i.e., I do not know who is going to do the work).

3. I would somehow weave into the Terms of Reference the thought that the output document would serve as a roadmap for guidelines on the particular issues and, therefore, give some sense towards what is required programatically to resolve the issues (i.e., tie it somehow into what the document can be used for).

4. The committee working group noted under the "Procedures" section is pretty vague. Are we thinking about one group per issue or are they functional or what?

5. The date for completion ought to be thought out a bit. We may be better off using something generic like the summer of 1986.

6. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the paper has got to recognize that lots of work aimed at the same kinds of answers has been done, e.g., the FSCS study. What we need to do is not convey an image that we would redo that, but rather take advantage of that work and attempt to package an all-intelligence discipline product.

7. What are the issues - How do you get them identified - What is a reasonable game plan from start to finish are some things that really should be well thought out before any paper goes out for the Program Managers.

DCI GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Background. The most recent statement of the DCI's Goals and Objectives (1984-1990) was published in February, 1982, based on a capabilities study completed in late 1981. Sufficient time has elapsed to bring into question the continued applicability of the document.

Discussion. There are two options available to develop updated goals and objectives:

A. Start from scratch, building goals and objectives without reference to the published document. In theory, this would produce a new statement uncolored by old thinking (which could then be compared to the old document). The advantage lies in the promise of a fresh approach. Disadvantages consist of the needless time that would be spent in "reinventing the wheel," and the implied loss of credibility for the relevance of the process and the existing document (e.g. "We just did this a couple of years ago and painfully agreed on what was most important; why start over?" If this option is chosen the recommended approach is to begin with a memo to Program Managers from the DCI, outlining the requirements and asking for a working group representative from the agencies' planning divisions. The working group would meet under PPS sponsorship for a period of 3-4 months to draft new goals and objectives. Initial guidance would be furnished by the Planning Steering Group chaired by D/PPS, which could also approve the draft prior to its submission to the Program Managers for final coordination. If desired, the final draft could be a principal agenda item for a late winter/early spring offsite conference.

B. Focus on a review of the existing document. The premise here is to examine the goals and objectives already stated by the DCI at roughly the midpoint of the period they cover. A principal advantage would be continuity, i.e. building on an already accepted statement of needs. A review of the "challenges ahead" sections of recent annual DCI reports to the Congress suggests that a number of the issues addressed in the current statement are of continuing concern. The objective of the review would be to assess the validity of the statement, reaffirm or revise its contents where needed, and--as a byproduct--measure the progress that has been made. Again, the first step would be a memo from the DCI to Program Managers telling them what he has in mind and inviting participation. Rather than proceeding directly to a working group, the Program Managers could be asked to conduct independent reviews and submit results to PPS, highlighting progress (measured by adjustment or deletion of objectives) and proposing other additions or alterations where needed. PPS would then prepare a synthesis draft, much as was done for the last annual report, which would be returned for coordination and then made an agenda item for the Planning Steering Group. (If wide disparity is present, the synthesis could be prepared by a working group.) Final coordination by Program Managers and/or consideration at the next offsite would remain as the final steps.

For either option, the IC Staff would be invited to contribute at an early point in the process, either as a means of providing new grist for a working group mill, or as another contributor to the review.

Recommendation.   Choose option B. as a logical follow-on to previously accomplished work.